

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 22-424

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

July 5, 2023

The complainant alleged a city court commissioner denied his right to a jury trial

The role of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine whether a judicial officer has engaged in conduct that violates the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct or Article 6.1 of the Arizona Constitution. There must be clear and convincing evidence of such a violation in order for the Commission to take disciplinary action against a judicial officer.

The Commission does not have jurisdiction to overturn, amend, or remand a judicial officer's legal rulings. The Commission reviewed all relevant available information and concluded there was not clear and convincing evidence of ethical misconduct in this matter. The complaint is therefore dismissed pursuant to Commission Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on July 5, 2023.

: AUTOGRAPH: COPYRIGHT/COPYCLAIM  
: All Rights Reserved

ARIZONA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

COUNTY OF , STATE OF

Plaintiff, ) CASE NO.  
vs. )  
Commissioner ) NOTICE OF COMPLAINT  
Court ) AGAINST COMMISSIONER  
State of ) UNDER THE  
Respondent, ) JUDICIAL CONDUCT AND  
DISABILITY ACT OF 1980, 28  
U.S.C. §351-§364, AND THE  
RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT  
AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY  
PROCEEDINGS.

NOTICE OF COMPLAINT AGAINST COMMISSIONER UNDER  
THE JUDICIAL CONDUCT AND DISABILITY ACT OF 1980, 28 U.S.C. §351-  
§364, AND THE RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY  
PROCEEDINGS

I, , who is not a person, a corporation, a  
government employee, nor attempting to play the role of an  
attorney, for I am a natural born living man, and one of the  
people standing upon the law of the land as my shield and  
ordering equal protection of the law under the Bill of Rights.

1. (here-in-after "Plaintiff") is a living man and,  
 2. in the court of record, complains and challenges Commissioner  
 3. , Court, and the State of  
 4. , who are each summoned to answer the said Respondent to  
 5. wit:

7. 1. Commissioner has denied the  
 8. right to trial by jury. IT IS A FACT BEFORE THE COURT THAT,  
 9. HAS A RIGHT TO PRIVACY AND RIGHT TO LIFE,  
 10. LIBERTY, AND PROPERTY, WHICH CAN NOT BE DEPRIVED UNLESS BY  
 11. DUE PROCESS OF THE LAW. A CONTROVERSY OF MORE THAN  
 12. REQUIRES A TRIAL BY JURY AS GUARANTEED BY THE 7TH  
 13. AMENDMENT. IT IS A FACT BEFORE THE COURT THAT Commissioner  
 14. AND THE Court HAVE ORDERED  
 15. THE REPAYMENT OF A PRESUMED DEBT OVER WITHOUT HOLDING A  
 16. TRIAL BY JURY.

17. 2. Commissioner has refused to show the  
 18. jurisdiction the court is operating under. Commissioner  
 19. and the have assumed  
 20. jurisdiction, wherein jurisdiction cannot be assumed.

21. 3. "Relator" asserts that the judgment is void because: (1).  
 22. The court had no jurisdiction to enter it. (2). It has no  
 23. support in the evidence. (3). It denies relator due process  
 24. of law as guaranteed by Article I, Sec. 19 of the  
 25. Constitution of Texas, Vernon's Ann. St. and the Fifth and  
 26. Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United  
 27.

States." Ex parte R.P. DAVIS, Jr. 344 S.W.2d 153

(1961). Commissioner

AND THE

Court ENTERED A DEFAULT JUDGMENT AGAINST

WHILE THE "court had no jurisdiction to enter  
it", THE COURT HAD "no support in the evidence", AND THE  
COURT DENIED "due process of

law." Commissioner

AND THE

Court **DID NOT PROVIDE EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT** OF THE CLAIMS  
AGAINST . THE RESPONSES OF Commissioner

AND THE

Court **DID NOT**

**PROVIDE CLARIFICATION OF JURISDICTION CREATED BY A JUDICIAL  
OFFICER OF THE COURT IN ACCORDANCE WITH DUE PROCESS OF THE  
LAW. ANY ORDER BY A COURT WITHOUT PROPER JURISDICTION OR  
ISSUED WITHOUT SUBSTANTIVE DUE PROCESS IS VOID AND  
UNENFORCEABLE.**

4. Commissioner entered a plea of default on  
behalf of , which is practicing law from the  
bench. did not enter or consent to enter

into a contract or agreement with Commissioner

or the Court to enter a plea on his  
behalf. Nor has entered or consented to

enter into any contract or agreement with Commissioner

or the

Court.

5. Commissioner denied the

right to exercise his Sixth Amendment right. THE 6TH

AMENDMENT OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS GUARANTEES THE RIGHT "to a

1. *speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the state*  
2. *and district wherein the crime shall have been committed,*  
3. *which district shall have been previously ascertained by*  
4. *law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the*  
5. *accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against*  
6. *him."* Commissioner denied "to a speedy and  
7. *public trial, by an impartial jury"* the  
8. right to Commissioner denied  
9. the right to exercise the Sixth Amendment right  
10. and denied disclosing "the nature and cause of the  
11. *accusation[s]"* against . Commissioner  
12. denied the right "to be  
13. *confronted with the witnesses against him."*

14. 6. FOR THE Court TO HAVE JURISDICTION, THERE  
15. MUST BE A VICTIM/INJURED PARTY PRESENT, AND UNDER OATH WITH  
16. AN INJURY, IN FACT, THAT IS NOT MERELY SPECULATIVE OR  
17. CONJECTURE ENTERED INTO EVIDENCE. WHEREBY, Commissioner  
18. REFUSED TO COMPLY WITH THE SUPREME COURT'S  
19. OPINION IN MATTER **LUJAN V DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE et al. 504**  
20. **U.S. 555 (1992)**. WHEREIN IT STATES, "Over the years, our  
21. *cases have established that the irreducible constitutional*  
22. *minimum of standing contains three elements. First, the*  
23. *plaintiff must have suffered an "injury in fact" - an*  
24. *invasion of a legally protected interest which is (a)*  
25. *concrete and particularized*, see *id.*, 756 Warth v. Seldin,  
26. 422 U.S. 490, 508 (1975); *Sierra Club v. Morton*, 405 U.S.

727, 740-741, n. 16(1972); [1] and (b) 'actual or imminent, not "conjectural" or "hypothetical,"' Whitmore, supra, at 155 (quoting Los Angeles v. Lyons, 461 U.S. 95, 102 (1983)). Second, there must be a causal connection between the injury and the conduct complained of - injury has to be 'fairly ... trace[able] to the challenged action of the defendant, and not ... th[e] result [of] the independent action of some third party not before the court.' Simon v. Eastern Ky. Welfare Rights Organization, 426 U.S. 26, 41-42 (1976). Third, it must be 'likely,' as opposed to merely 'speculative,' that the injury will be 'redressed by a favorable decision.' Id., 38, 43." **(LUJAN V DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE et al. 504 U.S. 555 (1992))**. Commissioner

and the Court FAILED TO ENSURE THE CONSTITUTIONAL MINIMUM STANDARD REQUIRING THE TO INTRODUCE EVIDENCE SHOWING AN INJURY, IN FACT, CAUSED BY SOME CONDUCT OF THE Commissioner

has failed to produce evidence of injury and has assumed jurisdiction, wherein jurisdiction cannot be assumed. A JUDGE WHO FAILS TO CLARIFY EVIDENCE IS PROOF OF AN ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS ACT AND NOT A MINISTERIAL ACT RELYING UPON FACTS AND EVIDENCE.

7. Commissioner FAILED TO PROVIDE AN ACCEPTANCE OF HER PUBLIC OATH OF OFFICE, AND THAT SHE WILL DEFEND THE CONSTITUTION AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS.

Commissioner ACTED OUT OF HER PUBLIC OATH

**THE COMMISSION'S POLICY IS  
TO POST ONLY THE FIRST FIVE  
PAGES OF ANY DISMISSED  
COMPLAINT ON ITS WEBSITE.**

**FOR ACCESS TO THE  
REMAINDER OF THE  
COMPLAINT IN THIS MATTER,  
PLEASE MAKE YOUR REQUEST  
IN WRITING TO THE  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL  
CONDUCT AND REFERENCE  
THE COMMISSION CASE  
NUMBER IN YOUR REQUEST.**